

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SAMUEL HOWARD, )  
 ) 3:13-cv-00163-MMD-VPC  
 )  
 Plaintiff, ) **MINUTES OF THE COURT**  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 RENEE BAKER, *et al.*, )  
 ) November 20, 2014  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (#30) of the court's order denying appointment of counsel (#26), and defendants' response thereto (#32). Plaintiff did not file a reply. Having reviewed the papers, the court **DENIES** plaintiff's motion.

This court may reconsider a prior order. *See Henry v. Rizzolo*, No. 2:08-cv-00635-PMP-GWF, 2010 WL 3636278, at \*1 (D. Nev. Sept. 10, 2010); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(a). However, a motion for reconsideration is proper only where the moving party sets forth "some valid reason why the court should revisit its prior order" and also "facts or law of a 'strongly convincing nature' in support of reversing the prior decision." *Henry*, 2010 WL 3636278, at \*1 (quoting *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003)).

Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration does not meet this burden. It contains only plaintiff's affidavit and related exhibits, which establish he is legally blind and struggles to complete tasks related to this litigation, and also plaintiff's reiteration that he lacks law clerk assistance because he is held in isolation. Plaintiff provided this information to the court in his original motion (#22). The court fully considered it at that time. The court therefore **DENIES**

the motion. It fails to articulate a valid reason for revisiting the prior order, and also lacks any argument in support of reversal.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Deputy Clerk